

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 13-17 are pending.

The Examiner rejected claims 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), as being anticipated by Soininen et al. (6,482,740) or Aronowitz et al (6,649,219 or 6,511,925).

Regarding claim 13, the Examiner failed to specifically point out anything in Soininen that teaches preferentially desorbing unreacted reactive species. Soininen, col. 6, lines 26-39, disclose a low volatility oxide of a metal, as the first reactive species deposited on the substrate and that this low volatility oxide of a metal is at least partially converted into a metal by providing a reducing agent. Such a low volatility oxide would be difficult to desorb and more difficult to preferentially desorb. Thus, the thin film of the low volatility oxide of Soininen would be different from the film produced as claimed.

The Examiner failed to specifically point out anything in Aronowitz et al. (6,642,219 or 6,511,925) that teaches preferentially desorbing unreacted reactive species, as recited in claim 13. These references do not teach preferentially desorbing unreacted reactive species. In addition, the Examiner failed to specifically point out a thin film in the references that would be the same thin film that is recited in claim 13. For at least these reasons, claim 13 is not anticipated by the cited references.

The Examiner rejected claims 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), as being anticipated by Hasegawa et al (5,746,826). The Examiner failed to specifically point out anything in Hasegawa that teaches or suggests chemically reacting the layer of the first reactive species with a second reactive species to create a first product, as recited in claim 13. In addition, the Examiner failed to specifically point out in Hasegawa preferentially desorbing an unreacted reactive species leaving a layer of the first product. In addition, the Examiner failed to specifically point out a thin film in Hasegawa that would be the same thin film that is recited in claim 13. For at least these reasons, claim 13 is not anticipated by Hasegawa et al.

Claims 14-17 are ultimately dependent on claim 13, and are therefore respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with

Att. Dkt. No. 01-508/1D / LSI1P174

App. No. 10/804,980

Page 4 of 5

respect to claim 13. Additionally, these dependent claims require additional elements that, when taken in the context of the claimed invention, further patentably distinguish the art of record. For at least these reasons, claims 14-17 are not anticipated or made obvious by the cited references.

Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at telephone number (650) 961-8300.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Michael Lee  
Registration No. 31,846

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
Telephone: (650) 951-8300